

REMARKS

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7, 9-13, 15 and 16 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 8 and 14 have been canceled by this amendment.

I. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the abstract for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In particular, Applicants note that the abstract has been objected to for being more than one paragraph. By this amendment, Applicants note that the abstract has been amended so as to be a single paragraph, thereby addressing the Examiner's objection.

Accordingly, Applicants kindly request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the above-noted objection to the specification.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101, first paragraph

Claim 16 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. By this amendment, Applicants note that claim 16 has been amended so as to be directed to a program recorded on a computer-readable recording medium.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 is drawn to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Accordingly, Applicants kindly request that the above-noted rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103(a)

A. Claims 1-5, 9, 12, 15 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kwok et al. (US 6,115,057); and claims 8 and 14 have been rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Nakasone (JP 2003-078840).

By this amendment, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended so as to include features similar to those recited in original claim 8. In particular, Applicants note that claim 1 has been amended so as to recite that the broadcast wave includes limit information which limits judgment of the judging unit, and the judging unit is operable to judge, when the receiving unit receives the limit information while the display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit information regardless of a user's operation.

Applicants respectfully submit that Kwoh and Nakasone, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted combination of features recited in amended claim 1.

With respect to Kwoh, Applicants note that this reference discloses a display device having parental control features, in which it is possible to block a video display, and replace the video display with textual data (see Abstract and col. 16, lines 15-19). For example, as explained in Kwoh, during the time that PG-13 rated video data is being blocked, textual data is displayed on the screen which describes what is happening in the video program (see col. 16, lines 22-28).

Based on the foregoing description, Applicants note that while Kwoh discloses the ability to replace video data with textual data, that Kwoh does not disclose or suggest the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which indicate that the broadcast wave includes limit information which limits judgment of the judging unit, and the judging unit is operable to judge, when the receiving unit receives the limit information while the display unit displays the

broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit information regardless of a user's operation.

With respect to Nakasone, Applicants note that this reference discloses a display device that has the ability to transmit a power stop program from a broadcasting station 1 to a receiver 2, wherein the power stop program causes the power supply for a display 202 to be stopped (see Abstract and Figs. 1 and 2).

In this regard, Applicants note that the power stop program of Nakasone is transmitted to the receiver 2 when the information being transmitted to the receiver 2 includes only audio data (i.e., no video data). As explained in Nakasone, in such a situation (i.e., only audio data being transmitted), because there is no video data to be displayed on the display 202 of the receiver 2, it is beneficial to stop the power supply to the display 202 in order to reduce power consumption (e.g., see Abstract). As further disclosed in Nakasone, upon receiving the power stop program at the receiver 2, in addition to the power supply to the display 202 being stopped, the channel of the program being received is displayed on an LCD 204 (see Abstract).

In the Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that, in Nakasone, the information transmitted from the broadcasting station 1 to the receiver 2 includes “limit information” (see Office Action at page 9).

Regarding such a position, based on the foregoing description of Nakasone, Applicants note that while Nakasone discloses the ability to transmit information (i.e., the power stop program) which causes the power supply for a display 202 to be stopped, that such an ability does not correspond to the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1 which set forth that the limit information limits judgment of the judging unit, and the judging unit is operable to

judge, when the receiving unit receives the limit information while the display unit displays the broadcast contents, that the broadcast contents should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit information regardless of a user's operation.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Nakasone does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted features recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claim 1 is patentable over such a combination of references, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 2-5 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Regarding claim 12, Applicants note that this claim has been amended so as to recite that the transmission unit is operable to transmit, included in the broadcast wave, limit information which imposes a limitation on a display of broadcast contents so that the display of the broadcast contents is forced to continue.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Nakasone does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claim 14 depends from claim 12 and is therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

Regarding claims 15 and 16, Applicants note that each of these claims has been amended to recite that the broadcast wave includes limit information which limits judgment in said judging step, and in said judging step, when the limit information is received in said receiving

step while the broadcast contents are displayed in said display step, it is judged that the broadcast contents should be continuously displayed after the reception of the limit information regardless of a user's operation.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Kwoh and Nakasone does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in amended claims 15 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,157) in view of Tsukagoshi (US 5,684,542)

Claim 6 depends from claim 1, and claim 13 depends from claim 12. Applicants submit that Tsukagoshi fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Nakasone, as discussed above, with respect to amended claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 6 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Palmer (US 5,195,135).

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Applicants submit that Palmer fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Nakasone, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

D. Claims 10 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwoh et al. (US 6,115,057) in view of Lee et al. (US 2001/0049296).

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Applicants submit that Lee fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwoh and Nakasone, as discussed above, with respect to amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 10 and 11 are patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Kohei YAMAGUCHI et al.

/Kenneth W. Fields/
By: 2008.07.29 10:31:58 -04'00'
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/krq
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 29, 2008